

New Integrable Systems from Unitary Matrix Models*

Alexios P. Polychronakos

*Pupin Physics Laboratories, Columbia University,
New York, NY 10027*

Abstract: We show that the one dimensional unitary matrix model with potential of the form $aU + bU^2 + h.c.$ is integrable. By reduction to the dynamics of the eigenvalues, we establish the integrability of a system of particles in one space dimension in an external potential of the form $a \cos(x + \alpha) + b \cos(2x + \beta)$ and interacting through two-body potentials of the inverse sine square type. This system constitutes a generalization of the Sutherland model in the presence of external potentials. The positive-definite matrix model, obtained by analytic continuation, is also integrable, which leads to the integrability of a system of particles in hyperbolic potentials interacting through two-body potentials of the inverse hyperbolic sine square type.

* This research was supported in part by the United States Department of Energy under contract DE-AC02-76ER02271.

In one space dimension an integrable class of systems is known, involving particles coupled through two-body potentials of a particular form. The generic type of these potentials is of the inverse square form. Calogero [1] first solved the three-body problem in the quantum case for inverse square interactions and quadratic external potential. Later on, the full N -body problem was solved and shown to be integrable in both the classical and the quantum case [2] and further to be related to Lie algebras [3]. Sutherland [4] solved the problem with inverse sine square interactions (and no external potentials), which can be thought as the inverse square potential rendered periodic on the circle. Eventually, it was realized that the system of particles with two-body potentials of the Weierstrass function type is integrable [5,6]. Again, these potentials can be thought as the inverse square potential rendered periodic on a complex torus. For a review of these systems and a comprehensive list of references see [6].

An interesting feature of the above systems is that, at least some of them, admit a matrix formulation [6,7]. Specifically, the inverse square potential arises out of a hermitian matrix model, and the inverse sine square potential arises from a unitary matrix model. The matrix formulation is in many respects a better framework to study these systems. Such hermitian matrix models have been studied in physics in the context of large- N expansions [8-10] and, recently, non-perturbative two-dimensional gravity [11]. Although the one dimensional ($c = 1$) unitary model has not been studied in this context, discrete ($c < 1$) models have been considered [12]. Further, the inverse square potential was shown to be of relevance to fractional statistics [13] and anyon physics [14]. It becomes, therefore, of interest to look for integrable systems with more general potentials.

In a previous paper [15] we achieved such a generalization for the Calogero system; specifically, it was shown that the system of particles with inverse square potential interactions remains integrable at the presence of external potentials which are a general quartic polynomial in the coordinate. In this paper, we obtain a generalization of the Sutherland model; that is, we show that the system of particles with inverse sine square interactions remains integrable at the presence of external potentials of the form $a \cos(x + \alpha) + b \cos(2x + \beta)$. An appropriate scaling limit of this system, then, is shown to reproduce the previous quartic system. In addition, the system with all trigonometric functions in the potentials replaced by their hyperbolic counterparts (i.e., the inverse sinh square system with hyperbolic external potentials) is also integrable.

The fact that integrability seems to work only for the above type of external potentials is somewhat puzzling. It is known, for instance, through a collective field description of the hermitian matrix model, that the large- N inverse square system is integrable for any external potential [16]. (Although there is no corresponding result for the unitary model we have little doubt that the same is true there.) This could be, though, just another special property of the large- N system. At any rate, the method of this paper seems to work only for the above-mentioned potentials.

The system to be considered is a unitary matrix model in one time dimension with lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L} = -\frac{1}{2}\text{tr}(U^{-1}\dot{U})^2 - \text{tr}W(U) \quad (1)$$

where U is a unitary $N \times N$ matrix depending on time t , and overdot denotes time derivative. The potential $W(U)$ must be hermitian for consistency. The equations of motion from (1) read

$$\frac{d}{dt}(U^{-1}\dot{U}) - W'U = 0 \quad (2)$$

Due to the invariance of (1) under time independent unitary transformations of U , there is a conserved traceless matrix, namely

$$[\dot{U}, U^{-1}] \equiv iP \quad (3)$$

as can explicitly be checked using (2). P is the generator of unitary transformations of U and constitutes a kind of conserved “angular momentum” in the (curved) space $U(N)$. The eigenvalues of U , on the other hand, written as e^{ix_n} , $n = 1, \dots, N$, can be thought as coordinates of N particles on the circle. Take, now, the particular case where all but one of the eigenvalues of P are equal, that is

$$P = \alpha(N|u\rangle\langle u| - 1) \quad (4)$$

where $|u\rangle$ is a constant N -dimensional unit vector. This P is naturally obtained by gauging the $U(N)$ invariance and coupling the system to fermions [17]. Then it can be shown with a method analogous to [17] that the eigenvalues of U satisfy the equations of motion

$$\ddot{x}_n = -V'(x_n) + \sum_{m \neq n} \frac{\alpha^2 \cos \frac{x_n - x_m}{2}}{4 \sin^3 \frac{x_n - x_m}{2}} \quad (5)$$

where the potential of the particles is defined

$$V(x) = W(e^{ix}) \quad (6)$$

and prime denotes x -derivative. These are exactly the equations of motion of particles of unit mass moving in the external potential V and interacting through the two-body potential

$$V_2(x) = \frac{\alpha^2}{(2 \sin \frac{x}{2})^2} \quad (7)$$

In the absence of external potentials, the above system is the Sutherland system which is known to be integrable. It is the purpose of this paper to show that the system remains integrable in the presence of external potentials $V(x)$ of the form

$$V(x) = a_1 \cos x + a_2 \sin x + b_1 \cos 2x + b_2 \sin 2x \quad (8)$$

The above potential can be thought as a generalization on the circle of the quartic potential on the line. Indeed, the quartic potential is in fact a special case of the above potential and can be obtained from it in the limit of infinite radius of the circle. To see this, introduce explicitly the radius R by rescaling

$$x \rightarrow \frac{x}{R}, \quad t \rightarrow \frac{t}{R^2} \quad (9)$$

In terms of the new variables the potential becomes

$$V(x) \rightarrow \frac{1}{R^2} V\left(\frac{x}{R}\right) \quad (10)$$

Then, by choosing the coefficients of the potential to scale as

$$\begin{aligned} a_1 &= -\frac{8}{3} R^4 a - 8 R^6 c, \quad a_2 = 2 R^5 b \\ b_1 &= 2 R^6 c + \frac{1}{6} R^4 a, \quad b_2 = -R^5 b \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

we see that upon taking the limit $R \rightarrow \infty$ we recover the potential

$$V(x) = ax^2 + bx^3 + cx^4 \quad (12)$$

It should be clear that this is essentially the only scaling that leads to a finite potential at the large R limit. Therefore, the integrability of the present model also contains the integrability of the quartic system as a limiting special case.

We shall then consider the unitary matrix problem with potential

$$W(U) = \frac{A}{2}U + \frac{A^*}{2}U^{-1} + \frac{B}{2}U^2 + \frac{B^*}{2}U^{-2} , \quad A \equiv a_1 - ia_2 , \quad B \equiv b_1 - ib_2 \quad (13)$$

Through a rotation of the circle, that is, through a redefinition of U of the form $U \rightarrow e^{i\phi}U$, we can always redefine the phase of B . So, for simplicity we will choose B real. We shall define the “left-hamiltonian matrix” H as

$$H = -\frac{1}{2}(U^{-1}\dot{U})^2 + W(U) \quad (14)$$

whose trace gives the energy of the system. Similarly, we can define the “right-hamiltonian matrix”

$$\tilde{H} = -\frac{1}{2}(\dot{U}U^{-1})^2 + W(U) = UHU^{-1} \quad (15)$$

Although the trace of the above matrices is a conserved quantity, neither of them is conserved as a matrix, nor are their eigenvalues. Consider, now, the matrices

$$L = H + \frac{\kappa}{2}[U^{-1}\dot{U}, U + U^{-1}] , \quad M = -\frac{1}{2}U^{-1}\dot{U} + \frac{\kappa}{2}(U - U^{-1}) \quad (16)$$

Then, upon using the equations of motion it is possible to show that

$$\dot{L} + [L, M] = 0 \quad (17)$$

provided that we choose κ as

$$\kappa^2 = B \quad (18)$$

Therefore, the matrices L and M constitute a Lax pair [18] and the eigenvalues of L are conserved. Equivalently, the traces

$$I_n = \text{tr} L^n \quad (19)$$

are constants of the motion. Restoring, now, an arbitrary phase to B , through a phase redefinition of U , we get that the Lax matrices in the most general case are

$$2L = -\frac{1}{2}(U^{-1}\dot{U})^2 + AU + BU^2 + \kappa[U^{-1}\dot{U}, U] + h.c. \quad (20)$$

$$M = -\frac{1}{2}U^{-1}\dot{U} + \kappa U - h.c. \quad (21)$$

where $h.c.$ denotes hermitian conjugate. Notice that L is hermitian while M is antihermitian. Relations (17) and (18) remain unchanged.

Alternatively, we could write the “right-Lax pair” matrices $\tilde{L}$, $\tilde{M}$, by substituting $\dot{U}U^{-1}$ for $U^{-1}\dot{U}$ in (20) and (21) and flipping the sign of the first term in M . The two choices are really equivalent, connected through a unitary transformation generated by U itself.

The above are true without any assumptions for the constant commutator P . Assuming, now, that P is of the form (4), we can express the conserved quantities I_n in terms of particle coordinates x_n and momenta $p_n = \dot{x}_n$. To see this, perform a (time-dependent) unitary transformation on U which brings it to a diagonal form while it doesn't change I_n . Then, using (4), we see that the matrices of the system take the form

$$\begin{aligned} U_{ij} &= \delta_{ij} e^{ix_j} , \quad P_{ij} = \alpha(\delta_{ij} - 1) \\ (U^{-1}\dot{U})_{ij} &= i\dot{x}_i \delta_{ij} + \frac{i\alpha(1 - \delta_{ij})}{e^{i(x_i - x_j)} - 1} \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

The I_n , therefore, can be expressed using (22) in terms of particle quantities and constitute N independent integrals of motion for the system of particles in the potential (8) interacting through inverse sine square two-body potentials of strength α^2 . I_1 is the total energy of the system. I_2 has the form

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 &= \sum_i \left(\frac{1}{2} p_i^2 + \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{\alpha^2}{2s_{ij}^2} + V(x_i) \right)^2 + \sum_{i \neq j \neq k \neq i} \left(\frac{\alpha^2}{2s_{ij}s_{jk}} \right)^2 \\ &\quad + \sum_{i \neq j} \left(\frac{\alpha(p_i + p_j)}{2s_{ij}} \right)^2 - \frac{|B|\alpha^2}{2} \sum_{i \neq j} \cos(x_i + x_j + \beta) \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

where we defined

$$s_{ij} = 2 \sin \frac{x_i - x_j}{2} , \quad B = |B| e^{i\beta} \quad (24)$$

and used the identity

$$\sum_{\{i,j,k,l \text{ distinct}\}} \frac{1}{s_{ij}s_{jk}s_{kl}s_{li}} = 0 \quad (25)$$

We shall not give here the explicit form of the rest of I_n in terms of x_i , p_i , which is quite complicated. Their independence is obvious from the fact that, just as in the hermitian case, I_n is a polynomial in p_i of order $2n$ with highest order term of the form $\sum_i p_i^{2n}$, and such terms cannot be obtained from lower order terms for $n \leq N$.

The above Lax pair matrices go over to the Lax matrices of the hermitian problem in the limit of infinite radius, under the simultaneous scaling (9) and (11) for the coordinates and the potential, and the rescaling

$$L \rightarrow \frac{1}{R^2}L, \quad M \rightarrow \frac{1}{R^2}M \quad (26)$$

In the case $c = 0$, though, there is no scaling limit, expressing the fact that the purely cubic potential does not admit a Lax pair formulation although it is still integrable.

It should also be noted that, just as in the hermitian case, there are two distinct Lax pairs, corresponding to the two possible choices of sign for κ in (18). Again, this has no impact on the conserved quantities I_n since the two choices give essentially the same set of conserved quantities, modulo traces of P^n , which are trivial nondynamical constants in the space of eigenvalues. Note also that, in the hermitian case, when the coefficient of the quartic term became negative the Lax matrix L became non-hermitian, indicating the runaway nature of the system. The integrals of motion, nevertheless, remained real. In the present case no such thing happens, since there can be no runaway behavior on the circle, and the Lax matrix (20) remains hermitian for all values of the coefficients of the potential.

The special case $B = 0$ is interesting: it corresponds to the quadratic hermitian model (i.e., the Calogero system) which is obtained as the large R scaling limit in this case. In particular, $L = H$ just as in the hermitian case. Contrary to the Calogero system, however, where H is a constant matrix, in this case there is still some nontrivial unitary rotation with time, due to the nonzero curvature of the space. Therefore, the gauge matrix of the Lax pair $M = -\frac{1}{2}U^{-1}\dot{U}$, generating this rotation, does not vanish. At the scaling limit, of course, M goes to zero.

It remains to show the fact that the above quantities are in involution, that is, that their Poisson brackets vanish. Again, as in the hermitian case, trying to use the explicit expressions of I_n in terms of particle phase space variables and using

$$\{x_i, p_j\} = \delta_{ij} \quad (27)$$

is completely hopeless. Instead, we shall work with the canonical structure of the original matrix problem and make use of the fact that the projection from the full matrix phase

space of U to the phase space of its eigenvalues is a hamiltonian reduction [6,7]. To see this, define from (1) a canonical momentum P_U

$$P_U = \frac{\delta \mathcal{L}}{\delta \dot{U}} = -U^{-1} \dot{U} U^{-1} \quad (28)$$

Then the symplectic two-form ω is

$$\omega = \text{tr} (dP_U dU) \quad (29)$$

giving rise to canonical Poisson brackets for U and P_U . For convenience, we shall work with the antihermitian matrix

$$\Pi \equiv -P_U U = U^{-1} \dot{U} \quad (30)$$

and the symplectic one-form $\mathcal{A}$, in terms of which we have

$$\mathcal{A} = -\text{tr} (\Pi U^{-1} dU) , \quad \omega = d\mathcal{A} \quad (31)$$

Decompose, now, U and Π in terms of diagonal and angular degrees of freedom, namely

$$U = V^{-1} \Lambda V , \quad \Pi = V^{-1} \left(N + \Lambda^{-1} [A, \Lambda] \right) V \quad (32)$$

with Λ and N diagonal unitary and antihermitian matrices, respectively:

$$\Lambda_{ij} = e^{x_i} \delta_{ij} , \quad N_{ij} = i p_i \delta_{ij} \quad (33)$$

and A an off-diagonal antihermitian matrix which will be identified with the off-diagonal part of $\dot{V} V^{-1}$ by the equations of motion. Then, in this parametrization (31) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A} &= \text{tr} \left(-N \Lambda^{-1} d\Lambda + (\Lambda A \Lambda^{-1} + \Lambda^{-1} A \Lambda - 2A) dV V^{-1} \right) \\ &= \sum_i p_i dx_i + \text{tr} \left(i P V^{-1} dV \right) \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

So $\mathcal{A}$ decomposes into two non-mixing parts, the first one being the particle phase space one-form leading to (27) and the second part identifying P as the variable canonically conjugate to the angular degrees of freedom. Therefore, the Poisson brackets of quantities expressible in terms of x_i and p_i can equally well be evaluated using the full matrix phase space Poisson structure.

To show the involution of I_n it is much more convenient to use the geometric formulation of symplectic manifolds, rather than work explicitly with Poisson brackets. In this

approach, we map to each function f on the phase space a vector field v_f on the phase space through the relation

$$\langle v_f, \omega \rangle = df \quad (35)$$

where $\langle, \rangle$ denotes internal product (contraction). The matrix differential operators δ_Π and $\delta_U U$ form a basis for the vector fields, satisfying

$$\langle (\delta_\Pi)_{ij}, d\Pi_{kl} \rangle = \langle (\delta_U U)_{ij}, (U^{-1}dU)_{kl} \rangle = \delta_{il}\delta_{jk}, \quad \text{else } \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle = 0 \quad (36)$$

In this basis, we can express the vector field v_f as

$$v_f = \text{tr}(v^1 \delta_\Pi + v^2 \delta_U U) \quad (37)$$

Then the Poisson bracket of any two functions f, g can be calculated as

$$\{f, g\} = v_f(g) = \text{tr}\left(v^1 \frac{\delta g}{\delta \Pi} + v^2 \frac{\delta g}{\delta U} U\right) \quad (38)$$

Therefore, defining $v_n = v_{I_n}$, we have

$$\{I_n, I_m\} = v_n(I_m) = m \text{tr}\left(L^{m-1} v_n(L)\right) \quad (39)$$

On the other hand, v_n satisfies

$$\langle v_n, \omega \rangle = dI_n = \text{tr}(L^{n-1} dL) \quad (40)$$

By expressing L in (20) in terms of Π and U and expanding dL as

$$dL = \sum_i R_i d\Pi S_i + \sum_i \tilde{R}_i U^{-1} dU \tilde{S}_i \quad (41)$$

and using the expression for ω derived from (31), that is

$$\omega = \text{tr}\left(-d\Pi U^{-1} dU + \Pi (U^{-1} dU)^2\right) \quad (42)$$

we get from (40)

$$v_n = -n \sum_i \text{tr}\left(\tilde{S}_i L^{n-1} \tilde{R}_i \delta_\Pi + [S_i L^{n-1} R_i, \Pi] \delta_\Pi - S_i L^{n-1} R_i \delta_U U\right) \quad (43)$$

Finally, substituting (43) in (39) we obtain

$$\{I_n, I_m\} = -nm \sum_{i,j} \text{tr}\left(L^{m-1} R_i \tilde{S}_j L^{n-1} \tilde{R}_j S_i + L^{m-1} R_i S_j L^{n-1} R_j \Pi S_i\right) - (m \rightleftharpoons n) \quad (44)$$

The rest is a tedious algebraic exercise, calculating the explicit expressions for R_i , S_i , $\tilde{R}_j$ and $\tilde{S}_j$ and evaluating (44). We shall omit all detail and simply give the result

$$\{I_m, I_n\} = mn(\kappa^2 - B) \operatorname{tr} \left(L^{m-1} U L^{n-1} [\Pi, U] \right) + h.c. - (m \rightleftharpoons n) \quad (45)$$

Choosing then κ as in (18) the Poisson brackets (45) vanish and the I_n are in involution. We have therefore proved the full integrability of the system.

The expression for L can be brought to a particularly suggestive form in a somewhat special case. Define the matrices

$$A = \Pi + Y(U) , \quad A^\dagger = -\Pi + Y(U) , \quad \text{with } Y(U) = \kappa U + \kappa^* U^{-1} + \lambda , \quad \lambda = \text{real} \quad (46)$$

Then $L = \frac{1}{2} A^\dagger A$ is exactly the previous Lax matrix (20), with B and κ properly connected. The coefficients of the potential, however, are constrained to obey the relation

$$\frac{B}{A^2} = \text{real} \quad (47)$$

The situation is again analogous to the hermitian case, where such an expression for L also existed for a similarly constrained potential. Note that, in this case

$$I_n(\kappa, \lambda) = \operatorname{tr} \left(\frac{1}{2} A^\dagger A \right)^n = \operatorname{tr} \left(\frac{1}{2} A A^\dagger \right) = I_n(-\kappa, -\lambda) \quad (48)$$

which shows that the two possible choices of sign for κ in (18) give exactly the same conserved quantities. The proof of involution of the I_n is also simplified in this case.

The above results can readily be extended to the case of positive definite matrices X . Such matrices can be expressed as

$$X = e^M , \quad M \text{ hermitian.} \quad (49)$$

They differ therefore from unitary matrices by a mere analytic continuation, and can be thought as unitary models with imaginary radius R . We can explicitly perform this continuation in the expressions for the Lax pair matrices, by putting $R = i$ in (9), (10), (11) and (26), which amounts to the redefinitions

$$\begin{aligned} U &\rightarrow X , \quad L \rightarrow -L \\ a_1 \pm ia_2 &\rightarrow -(a_1 \pm a_2) , \quad b_1 \pm ib_2 \rightarrow -(b_1 \pm b_2) \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

and now κ and κ^* are distinct, satisfying

$$\kappa^2 = -b_1 - b_2, \quad \kappa^{*2} = -b_1 + b_2 \quad (51)$$

The new potential of the system becomes

$$V(x) = a_1 \cosh x + a_2 \sinh x + b_1 \cosh 2x + b_2 \sinh 2x \quad (52)$$

Notice that, for (52) to be bounded from below, we must have

$$b_1 \pm b_2 > 0 \quad (53)$$

and for such values κ and κ^* both become imaginary. The Lax matrix becomes, explicitly

$$L = \frac{1}{2}\Pi^2 + W(X) + i\kappa_1[\Pi, X] + i\kappa_2[\Pi, X^{-1}] \quad (54)$$

where we put $\kappa = 2i\kappa_1$, $\kappa^* = 2i\kappa_2$. The momentum $\Pi = X^{-1}\dot{X}$ now is not antihermitian any more, but rather satisfies

$$\Pi^\dagger = X\Pi X^{-1} \quad (55)$$

Therefore, although L is not hermitian, it satisfies

$$L^\dagger = X L X^{-1} \quad (56)$$

which ensures that the conserved quantities I_n are real. Alternatively, we can directly make the analytic continuation

$$x_i \rightarrow ix_i, \quad p_i \rightarrow ip_i \quad (57)$$

into the expressions for I_n and obtain the new expressions. These will be conserved quantities for particles on the line, in an external potential of the type (52) interacting through two-body potentials of the type

$$V_2(x) = \frac{\alpha^2}{(2 \sinh \frac{x}{2})^2} \quad (58)$$

Systems of particles with the above two-body potential and no external potentials were known to be integrable. As we proved, they remain integrable in the presence of potentials of the form (52).

In conclusion, we see that the above unitary system (and its positive definite analytic continuation) is integrable and closely parallels the hermitian case. It is interesting that integrability again stops at potentials with only their two lowest nontrivial Fourier coefficients nonvanishing and does not extend to arbitrary periodic potentials. Obvious attempts to generalize the result to higher potentials, e.g., through a construction similar to (46) with arbitrary hermitian $Y(U)$, fail. This may be just a shortcoming of the method used. If, on the other hand, it turns out that integrability indeed stops at this level, it would be interesting to understand the deeper reason for that and the special significance of these potentials.

We should stress that, just as in the hermitian case, integrability does not necessarily imply complete solvability. The significance of the results is that the problem in the presence of the interparticle interaction remains as solvable as in the case of decoupled particles. The solution of these systems could conceivably be achieved in terms of the solutions of the one-body problem (which in general involves elliptic functions). The proof of integrability in the quantum domain is also of interest, especially in view of the conjecture put forth in [13] that the inverse square two-body potential on the line and the inverse sine square potential on the circle simply endow the particles with fractional statistics. These, as well as possible generalizations for other two-body potentials (e.g., of the Weierstrass form) remain interesting topics for further work.

REFERENCES

- [1] F. Calogero, *J. Math. Phys.* **12** (1971) 419.
- [2] J. Moser, *Adv. Math.* **16** (1975) 1; F. Calogero, *Lett. Nuovo Cim.* **13** (1975) 411; F. Calogero and C. Marchioro, *Lett. Nuovo Cim.* **13** (1975) 383.
- [3] M.A. Olshanetsky and A.M. Perelomov, *Invent. Math.* **37** (1976) 93.
- [4] B. Sutherland, *Phys. Rev.* **A4** (1971) 2019 and **A5** (1972) 1372.
- [5] B. Sutherland, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **34** (1975) 1083.
- [6] M.A. Olshanetsky and A.M. Perelomov, *Phys. Rep.* **71** (1981) 314 and **94** (1983) 6.
- [7] D. Kadzan, B. Kostant and S. Sternberg, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **31** (1978) 481.

- [8] A. Jevicki and H. Levine, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **44** (1980) 1443;
- [9] G. Marchesini and E. Onofri, *J. Math. Phys.* **21** (1980) 1103.
- [10] M.B. Halpern, *Nucl. Phys.* **B188** (1981) 61; M.B. Halpern and C. Schwartz, *Phys. Rev.* **D24** (1981) 2146; M.B. Halpern, *Nucl. Phys.* **B204** (1982) 93.
- [11] D.J. Gross and I.R. Klebanov, *Nucl. Phys.* **B344** (1990) 475 and **B354** (1991) 459.
- [12] Representative works in a growing literature on the subject are: V. Periwal and D. Shevitz, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **64** (1990) 1326 and *Nucl. Phys.* **B344** (1990) 344; K. Demeterfi and C.-I Tan, *Mod. Phys. Lett.* **A5** (1990) 1563; C. Crnkovic, M. Douglas and G. Moore, *Nucl. Phys.* **B360** (1991) 507; M.J. Bowick, A. Morozov and D. Shevitz, *Nucl. Phys.* **B354** (1991) 496.
- [13] A.P. Polychronakos, *Nucl. Phys.* **B324** (1989) 597.
- [14] J.M. Leinaas and J. Myrheim, *Phys. Rev.* **B37** (1988) 9286; A.P. Polychronakos, *Phys. Lett.* **B264** (1991) 362.
- [15] A.P. Polychronakos, Columbia preprint CU-TP-527, July 1991.
- [16] J. Avan and A. Jevicki, SLAC/Brown preprint SLAC-PUB-BROWN-HET-801.
- [17] A.P. Polychronakos, Columbia preprint CU-TP-520, to appear in *Phys. Lett. B*.
- [18] P. Lax, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **21** (1968) 467.